Exhibit F

A. Roughly four and a half, five years.
Q. And what are your duties in that position?
A. I supervise the five -- I have five first levels who I supervise; right now, roughly 70 technicians in the southeast Massachusetts and Rhode Island area.
Q. Okay, and who do you report to?
A. Lorna Deplitch.
Q. And what's her position?
A. She's the director of COEI for New York and New England.
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: What are those initials you said just before New York?
THE WITNESS: COEI, central office equipment installation.
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Thanks.
BY MR. MERRILL:
Q. Now, at some point in January of this year, did you become aware that Mr. Barber had taken a trip to Las Vegas while receiving disability benefits?
A. Yes.
Q. And how did you learn about that?
A. My first level David Paolino received an

e-mail from a Hal Anderson, who was a first level in the RMCC collections department, sixth floor, fifth and sixth floor of the building in Providence, Rhode Island, stating that they were investigating an issue that had been brought to their attention that Rodney Barber had been in Las Vegas.

Q. Okay, and what did you do as a result of receiving that e-mail?

A. David and I went down to the -- I believe it was down into the fifth floor. They call it the ready room. I'm not familiar with how their operation works, but where everybody was. We then went into a conference room with Hal Anderson and Anna Looney, another first level supervisor in that same department.

Q. Who is Anna Looney?

A. She's the first level in the RMCC.

Q. Okay. What's the RMCC?

A. It's the collections department, residents -- I couldn't tell you what the acronym stands for.

Q. Okay, and what was the -- what happened in that room?

A. Basically asked if Rodney Barber was an employee in our department.

Q. Who asked that?

A. Anna.

Q. Okay.

A. Anna Looney.

Q. Okay.

A. That there had been a wedding in Las Vegas over the New Year's holiday. They were investigating one of their employees who was at the wedding who was out on disability benefits, and it had been brought to their attention that Rodney was there while receiving benefits, and they wanted to make us aware of that situation.

Q. And do you know who their employee was that --

A. I learned it at that meeting, yes.

Q. Who was that?

A. Sandra Hurt.

Q. Okay, and do you know how -- did they indicate how they became aware that Rodney had been at the wedding?

A. Yvonne Taylor was at the wedding. She knew that Rodney had been there.

Q. Okay, and who is Yvonne Taylor?

record, next question.

(Company Exhibit No. 4 - Letter From Ms. Taylor Dated January 9 - was received into evidence.)

BY MR. MERRILL:

Q. Okay. Do you know who Sandra Hurt is?

A. She's an associate that worked at the RMCC.

Q. And did you become aware as to whether or not she traveled to Las Vegas on the same trip?

A. I did.

Q. Okay, and do you know if she was receiving disability benefits at that time?

A. I was informed she was, yes.

Q. Do you know if any subsequent action was taken for that trip?

MR. GURSKY: Well, objection.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Yes.

MR. GURSKY: What's the difference whether any subsequent action was taken with regard to another person? The Company's opening statement was that there was a consistent practice of terminating individuals, and you would think that they would have somebody that was terminated before Mr. Barber, not after; and if this is the same incident on the same day on the same trip, then the

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Anybody wants to propose one, now is the time.

MR. GURSKY: Why don't we just have the witness answer the question.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Since it takes two to tango.

MR. MERRILL: That's fine.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Do you recall the question after all that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I think so.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Go ahead and answer.

A. Yes, she was terminated.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Okay, thank you.

MR. MERRILL: Okay. Steve, can I see you for 30 seconds? Mr. Arbitrator, just indulge me 30 seconds.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Sure, sure.

(Discussion off the record.)

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Okay. Back on the record.

MR. MERRILL: Okay.

BY MR. MERRILL:

Q. Mr. Conway, following the meeting, did you

confirm information provided by Yvonne Taylor?
A. I did.
Q. Did she see Mr. Barber?
A. Yes.
Q. And did you receive that confirmation?
A. I did.
Q. Okay, and what information was provided in that confirmation?
A. That she did, in fact, see Rodney Barber. She listed that she saw him on the plane, at the wedding, at the dinner in Vegas, and on the trip back.
Q. Is there anything wrong with Mr. Barber traveling while on disability benefits?
A. He's not allowed to vacation or travel while on disability benefits without prior permission from MetLife, yes.
Q. Okay, and who is MetLife?
A. They're our agent that handles our FMLA disability pension -- I'm sorry -- plan. It's now Aetna, we've changed; but at that time, it was MetLife.
Q. Now, did you make any determination as to whether Mr. Barber had obtained permission to

Q. Did you make any determination as to whether or not Mr. Barber had permission to travel?
A. I did.
Q. And what was that determination?
A. That he neither had received permission, nor requested permission.
MR. GURSKY: Well, objection.
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Yes?
MR. GURSKY: It's more hearsay.
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Well --
MR. GURSKY: I just have to say, I understand the rule about hearsay and I understand particularly your rulings on hearsay and I understand that hearsay is typically allowed, but when a case is based entirely on hearsay, at some point you have to say no to the hearsay as an arbitrator.
And I think that if now we're going to be receiving testimony about what somebody from MetLife said about whether or not Mr. Barber had received permission or not or whether he had requested permission or not, what happened with regard to Mr. Barber and MetLife, that's just blatant hearsay. It goes to a core issue. The

objected to.
(The reporter read back the portion requested.)
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Okay. Next question.
BY MR. MERRILL:
Q. What was that determination based on?
MR. GURSKY: Well, it's the same question, just another way.
MR. MERRILL: I think it's the same question I asked before. I'm not sure that we identified it directly in the record.
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: I'm going to allow it.
A. Explain?
Q. Please.
ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: What was that determination based on, is the question.
THE WITNESS: Which determination?
BY MR. MERRILL:
Q. As to whether or not he had obtained permission to travel.
A. Oh, okay. Conversations with John Welling of MetLife.
Q. Okay. What were you informed by

Mr. Welling?

MR. GURSKY: Is this also not offered for the truth the way the last stuff wasn't offered for the truth? Because again, if it's offered for the truth, then it's a core issue according to this witness's testimony; and I understand that the Company wants to make this as quick and painless for itself as possible, but the burden is on the Company to prove just cause, and there are a lot of institutional and important reasons for the Company to prove its case by real evidence and not by hearsay.

The parties went through a whole lot of trouble to try and resolve this case. They were unable to do so. We're here to litigate it now, not to make it easy for the Company; and, you know, if it takes five days, then it takes five days. The burden is on the Company to prove just cause.

When every witness -- Ms. Taylor isn't here and now somebody from MetLife isn't here. It's fairly apparent that they were not prepared to litigate the case today. That's their decision and their choice.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Okay.

et cetera. So I am going to allow it, and I informed you how the panel will treat these kind of answers.

And to the extent that there are objections, sometimes there are more than we anticipated. Hopefully this will clear up some of them, but each of you know how to do your business, and I always assume that every objection is made in good faith.

Do we have a question outstanding?

MR. MERRILL: Can we go back to the witness's last answer?

(The reporter read back the portion requested.)

A. That Rodney Barber had in fact not received, nor requested, permission to travel while receiving benefits.

Q. Okay. Did you request any confirmation from Mr. Welling?

A. I did.

Q. Okay. What was that request?

A. That he send me an e-mail stating that fact. He did so. He had his -- the case supervisor, I believe his name is Chris Thomas, e-mail it to David Paolino, because I was out of the office that afternoon for a meeting.

Q. Okay. Were you provided with a copy of that e-mail?

A. I was.

Q. Who provided it to you?

A. David.

Q. David who?

A. Paolino.

Q. I'll show you a document that I will mark as Company 5.

(Company Exhibit No. 5 - E-mail - was marked for identification.)

BY MR. MERRILL:

Q. Do you recognize that?

A. Yes, that's the memo Dave handed to me.

Q. I'm sorry, do you recognize this document?

A. Yes.

Q. And what is it?

A. That's the e-mail Dave handed to me with a confirmation of my conversation with Mr. Welling.

MR. MERRILL: I offer that as Company 5.

ARBITRATOR HIGGINS: Any additional objection to Company Exhibit 5 beyond your ongoing objection to this line?

VZN/RB000805

MR. GURSKY: I'm sorry?
THE WITNESS: 2003.
BY MR. MERRILL:
Q. You believe or it was?
A. I believe. That's what I was informed in my investigation.
Q. Okay, okay. Does that get sent out to all employees or just some employees?
A. All Verizon employees.
Q. Okay. Now, is permission -- is traveling without permission also -- strike that. Is traveling without permission a violation of the code of business conduct?
A. Yes.
Q. Okay, and do all employees receive a code of business conduct?
A. They do.
Q. Did you make a determination as to whether or not Mr. Barber received the code?
A. I did.
Q. What was that?
A. I checked his personnel file, the form that is filled out by the supervisor when the code of conduct review is delivered, which is in his binder.

It was delivered in May of 2003 to Mr. Barber.
Q. I'll show you a document that's Company 3. Is that the document you're referring to?
A. It is.
Q. Now, did -- at some point, did you report to Lorna Deplitch --
A. I did.
Q. -- what you had been finding?
A. Yes.
Q. What did you report to her -- or when was that?
A. It was ongoing from the 13th, 14th. As I investigated and came up with pertinent information, I kept her informed of what was happening.
Q. Okay.
A. We did have a face-to-face meeting. I sat with her immediately after our staff meeting on the 15th.
Q. 15th of when?
A. January, 2004.
Q. And what happened at the meeting?
A. I just basically informed Ms. Deplitch of what we had found so far, that Rodney had indeed traveled to Las Vegas, he had not received

permission from MetLife, he was aware of the disability benefit plan, and he had been administered the code of business conduct for 2003.

Q. Now, what led you to the conclusion that he would have been aware of the disability benefit plan?

A. That was distributed in 2003. That he should have been aware of it? That's distributed periodically, and I believe it's in the package that goes out when they request their leave.

Q. Okay. Now, at some point, did you speak with Mr. Barber?

A. I did.

Q. When was that?

A. The following morning, January 16th, 2004.

Q. Okay, and who was present there?

A. Myself, Sharon Mello, David Paolino, my two first levels, Rodney, and Bobby Powers, Union rep.

Q. Okay, and what did you say to Mr. Barber, if anything?

A. We started off the meeting. I gave Rodney a letter of warning for his attendance. I just said that was a separate issue. We took care of that first. Then I asked Rodney where he was on the week